

# TLs IN ACTION: LAW



aLittleBitofPersonality.com

Prerequisites: [ILs in Action: First Gear](#)

Yay 2.1 posts! I'm very excited to be moving forward into moar!

So for this post, I'm going to talk about--you guessed it--Tech Levels of law! Law affects everything in life, no matter where, when, or how we live. If we live with good laws, bad laws, or no laws, each has a huge effect on our daily safety, plans, hopes, and possibilities. If we want to understand government or politics, we've gotta understand law. Likewise, if we want to understand money or the economy, we need a clear understanding of law in order to avoid simplifications and assumptions. It's amazing how many topics and questions all depend on an understanding of law: what it is, what it isn't, and how it all works.

Of course, what law is or isn't changes with each Tech Level. Just as other kinds of technology advanced through history, like transportation or medicine, law also followed the apparently inevitable IL progression, TL by TL. Sometimes, the word "law" sounds kinda scary, forceful, or inconvenient, like authoritative rules imposed from the outside that we have to be careful not to violate, for fear of punishment. That's not what law has to be, and in fact that kinda scary version is a characteristic of lower-TL law!

So you probably see where this is going, huh? Our modern, advanced, TL 7-8 culture isn't doing so well when it comes to law, this central backbone of what makes cultures thrive or rot. We accept the vitriolic sophistry of politics as normal, because we know nothing different, even though history and even some modern nations show us much better alternatives. People swing between extremes of fascism and anarchy, socialism and capitalism, collectivism and individualism, etc etc, always shouting the benefits of the one they think is best, and the endless debate continues to swing like a pendulum, while law gets a little more primitive and broken with each new swing.

So then let's dive into the TLs of law, so we can see the patterns at work here, and get past all the pendulum-y nonsense!

## TL 0 Law - State of Nature

As with all TLs, the TLs of law follow the progression of ILs, breakthrough by breakthrough. So, at TL 0, we have the absence of law. Just crazy barbarism. If everyone was LL 4+, then this could be a kind of pleasant anarchy, but...everyone isn't LL 4+, not in our culture at least. And even if we all were, then LL 4+ people tend to see that things simply work better when we pool our resources, energy, and compassion in order to make life better for everyone. Anarchy may seem appealing when we're sick of the abuses of law, but high-LL people make law good, while low-LL people need law to make them good :P

The phrase "State of Nature" is a common term (originally from INTP(ep) Thomas Hobbes) used to describe a totally lawless

situation. And I honestly hesitated to use it, because I usually try to avoid jargon anywhere I can. Not that I'm afraid it would be hard to understand or something, no, I'm just rather tired of when people hide behind jargon or learning in order to try to make up for a lack of independent, personal intelligence. Any inanimate IL 0 book can contain numerous facts, but it cannot draw intelligent, adaptive, useful conclusions from those facts. I want to do a mini-post about book-learning-vs-understanding, but for now, yeah "State of Nature" is often used pretentiously, but here it just fits so perfectly as a succinct way to describe TL 0 law - no law.

Frequently in a State of Nature, small groups of people will band together for mutual safety. They may improvise makeshift "laws" and rules, but none of it's very clearly defined. If you're caught alone in a State of Nature, and someone else has the strength, tools, or luck to hurt you, then you're on your own. This is the life of most animals, and it's the situation in many war-torn locales where might makes right, and roving gangs butcher and oppress the defenseless. It's the collapse and absence of law and of civilization itself.

## TL 1 Law - Despotism

Despots can take numberless forms, but in any case they are absolute rulers who exert their will on others without question or restraint. They are "might makes right" raised to an official, defined form. In TL 1 law, laws reflect the basic Recognition of IL 1: they are defined, but not much more than that. There's no conception of rights, safety, or the benefits of anyone but the law-maker. Whatever Pharaoh says goes. No question. No debate. Just the will of the despot.

TL 1 law doesn't limit itself to ancient cultures, though. During the rise of totalitarianism in TL 6, a lot of the more troubled countries, which were already sliding backward in their TLs of law, fell all the way back into the primitive, impatient cudgel of TL 1 Despotism. Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Soviet Russia, and Imperial Japan were some of the biggest and most noteworthy examples of TL 1 law mismatched with the power of TL 6 weapons. And still today, dictators favor the shortsighted inefficiency of the lowest real TL of law. Just like LL 1 people, countries with TL 1 law always have to funnel all their efforts into trying to excel in only one or two areas (like, say, the military) while all the rest of their civilization languishes in crushing poverty.

TL 1 despotic law applies in smaller groups, too. Families can be run according to TL 1 law when one parent's will is indisputable. A website or forum can become despotic if its owner rules with an iron fist. In churches, businesses, clubs, online gaming guilds, any group of people at all, TL 1 law reigns when the leader's will becomes undisputed law. This is often lauded as "efficient," just as LL 1 thinks itself clever and cunning, but this false sense of efficiency (or cunning) always comes at the cost of failure in every area except for the few specialized things the despot focuses on most. It is not uncommon in history for despots to seize control of wealthy, prosperous nations, thinking themselves a prosperous emperor, but right away they drive their nation into the ground and soon find themselves the lord of a crumbling, impoverished wreck. Even if a TL 1 regime stumbles on for decades, like the Soviet Union, it will be a grim, one-dimensional, perpetually dying place.

## TL 2 Law - Council

In TL 2, the absolute power of the despot gets spread among a council of some form: it might be a senate like in Rome, a democracy like Athens, a group of elders, a parliament, a peerage of nobles, a court of judges, officers in a game guild, or any group of multiple people who share actual power, rather than simply advising an all-powerful despot. This might seem inefficient to TL 1 tyrants, but it has the overwhelming advantage of bringing in multiple points of view that counter the one-sided whims and ambitions of any one member, and so it ends up being incomparably more efficient, more effective, and more prosperous.

Where the despot's will is law in TL 1, in TL 2 the majority always rules. This brings far greater sanity and balance to law, and thus to all the workings of society and to the private lives of everyone in it. But majority rule very frequently becomes the tyranny of the majority, or as the saying goes, two wolves and a sheep voting on what's for dinner.

In Western culture, we've frequently been taught that majority rule and democracy are justice itself, freedom itself, the very principles that America's noble Founders fought for, which then spread across the free world. We often see democracy as a magic pill, the opposite of tyranny, which will bring peace and order the more it spreads. And certainly, TL 2 law is far superior, more peaceful, and more prosperous than TL 1 tyranny, but seriously that isn't saying very much.

In truth, when it comes to the Founders of America, they were actually fighting for TL 4-5 law, but that isn't quite so convenient to the rulers of today's large-scale TL 2 representative-democracy Councils in nations across the world. So they appeal instead to the buzzwords of democracy, voting, and majority rule -- three things that frightened America's Founders almost as much as the abuses of a TL 1 king did (or, more accurately, the abuses of a runaway TL 2 Parliament), as we'll

see when we get to TLs 4 and 5.

TL 2 majority rule allows for fewer abuses than TL 1 tyranny, but still, if the majority votes for something, then it's law. End of story. The winners won, and the losers need to suck it up. If the majority votes for slavery, then slavery it is. If the majority votes to ban cream in coffee, then it's banned. If the majority says anything, then it must be right, because it came through a democratic vote, fair and square.

So instead of power being concentrated in a single, absolute ruler, it's dispersed among a group of many rulers. In a democracy, this means that we all rule, which is great! But it's also dangerous. Again, if we the people decide to vote for something awful, dangerous, or just plain foolish, then it's law. Better than a tyrant telling us what to do, but still primitive, clumsy, and a blockage to progress and prosperity. We may like to think of voting as some great modern thing, having a say in our own government, but it's as old as it is basic. It's so much better than tyranny, but it's still very rudimentary.

Like all TL 2 things, TL 2 majority rule reflects IL 2 and even LL 2, in both good ways and bad. When TL 2 law runs rampant, LL 2 spreads in all its shallow, simplistic social passion. And the same vice-versa: LL 2 cultures lead to TL 2 law, because LL 2 prefers the caprice of TL 2 law and fears TL 3+ law. All through history, every culture's approach to law has seemed to keep in nearly perfect sync with its overall LL, for good or for bad. This means that, while a low-LL culture will resist any change into higher TL law, such a change would have a miraculous effect on overall cultural LL.

Modern politics caters largely to LL 2 not because we all are (altho many are), but because we live under mainly TL 2 law. The longer we live under the simplifications of TL 2 law, the more congested all our laws and politics will become, the more broken and unpredictable our economy will grow, and the less any of us will feel like we really have any actual influence on the course of government.

## TL 3 Law - Common Law

"Common Law" is a term from England in the TL 3 Medieval Era, and today it's often used to describe systems of law based heavily on precedent. This means that laws are based on accumulated past experience of what's seemed to have worked well before. Rather than simply deciding law based on the whims or opinions of a majority, Common Law considers what has actually worked in the past, and what has not. Therefore, if the people vote for something that has proven disastrous in the past, that vote violates the accumulated experience of Common Law, so it doesn't become law and the people collectively dodge a bullet.

While many modern governments and especially legislatures settle for TL 2 law, there is still a great deal of TL 3 Common Law in many courts. The idea of "judicial review" originally placed courts as the guardians of Common Law, striking down any laws that seem to violate the time-tested lessons of the past, whether written or unwritten. This protected freedom and justice from the tyranny of mob rule, monopolies, and other oppressive majorities.

This practice of courts and judges reviewing and even creating laws became common in the Medieval era, especially in England. When people had a dispute or a problem which they couldn't solve themselves, they'd turn to wise men whom they trusted to come up with a just and fair solution. Especially good solutions were passed on, and these became laws, often unwritten ones, which everyone lived by. This is the more generic meaning of the term "Common Law": a law that's commonly known and accepted, even if it isn't actually written anywhere.

As more and more such solutions accumulated over time, Medieval judges began to study the decisions of past judges and share their ideas more frequently with one another. As with all things in TL 3, this TL 3 law displayed a great unifying compilation of different ideas. As time went on, judges had more and more past decisions they could read and learn from, and law become more sophisticated, more fair, and more adaptive to different situations.

Of course Common Law was not perfect by any means; a culture's prejudices and failings tended to influence its customs and laws, and sometimes the traditions of Common Law could lead to bizarre laws. Yet as with all IL 3 things, TL 3 Common Law was incomparably more stable, safe, and prosperous than the whims of TL 2 Councils' unchecked majority rule. It did not ensure a perfect life, but it ensured safety from mob rule and chaos, and it gave each person a secure knowledge that the law would always be as just as humanly possible. It provided a sense of stability for the future, which encouraged ever greater enterprises in wealth, exploration, and advancement, helping civilization mature.

Yet when TL 3 law goes bad, it slips back into TL 2 or even TL 1. If judges and courts cease to rely on the lessons of Common Law experience and instead seek to assert their own ideologies with the force of law, then they become a very small TL 2 Council, or even TL 1 Despots, leaving the rest of us to helplessly accept their rulings. Rather than judges standing as wise arbiters and mediators whom we trust to arrive at just and fair solutions based on the lessons of Common Law, they become fiat autocrats whose opinions and ideals are law. As a result, rather than trusting in our justice system to

do its job in predictable, stable fairness, people end up wringing their hands as they anxiously wait to see what the judges' whims will end up deciding. It's not law or order, it's war, as opposing ideologies seek to put more of their own judges into every court so that their ideals can be given the force of law. This is TL 2 at best, and often it's nothing more than TL 1 Despotism.

When a ruling comes down to us from such broken courts, that's it, it's law and we have to accept it. The only way out is to get another judge to change the ruling, as we anxiously beg for scraps and hope that this time our own cherished ideals will win. This is not TL 3 Common Law, it's just the same old wrestle of TL 2 majority rule invading the judiciary. There is no order or consistency, just a savage battle as ideologies form alliances which become political parties as they struggle to become king of the mud hill, able to make their treasured opinions law. There is little care to see what has actually worked in the past, as tradition is either mindlessly lauded or mindlessly dismissed, and every issue becomes muddled in propaganda and one-sided facts and figures intended to promote the speaker's views.

Very quickly, we forget how we even got here, and we shrug that law and government have to be this complicated, convoluted, and gridlocked, as the mud becomes too thick for us to have any perspective beyond the mosh pit. TL 3 Common Law does away with all this organized mobocracy, without stooping to the simplicity of a TL 1 tyrant. Countries and cultures in especially dire chaos often turn to dictators to restore order, but TL 1 Despotism cannot solve the problems of runaway TL 2 majority-rule-mudfighting. Only TL 3+ can bring lasting order, peace, security, and stability, ensuring more freedom, more fairness, more opportunity and safety. More complexity with less gridlock, more public discourse with less bickering, more progress with fewer fad-like crusades. TL 3 law is a Medieval thing, but it's still so much better than the TL 2 or even TL 1 mentalities we're taught to accept, as if there were no possible alternative.

And notice that I'm not talking about philosophies of government, I'm only addressing a culture's approach to law itself, what it is and how it works. Democracies, kingdoms, communist states, theocracies and even creative fictional governments, all can be any TL of law. Of course, some forms of government won't hold up anymore under higher TLs; typical Fascism kinda falls apart under Common Law, for instance. But my point is that I'm not going to rank capitalism vs socialism here or anything like that, because all of them always come to the same unfortunate place under low-TL law, just choosing slightly different paths to the same hellish destination. And all of them evolve into better, freer, more well-rounded governments under higher TLs of law. It all comes back to law, because law codifies how we approach life itself.

Our culture slipped back into TL 3 law in most respects during the early 20th Century, which was a grave loss compared to TL 4 law. But it was still far safer, more productive, and more stable than today's rampant flood of TL 2 law in both legislatures and courts, and especially in the minds of individuals. Nowhere is law demonstrated more sharply, or more importantly, then in how we each approach life, people, decisions, moral judgments, everything.

## TL 4 Law - Natural Law

Natural Law is a phrase that America's Founders seemed to love, and with good reason! (And I apologize for focusing so much on America's Founders; they're just such a perfect example of TL 4-5 law, in contrast with the lower TLs!) Natural Law refers to the laws of Nature, or in other words, natural cause and effect. The measurable, recordable, repeatable consequences of actions. When it comes to difficult decisions about law, policy, morality, or ideology, Natural Law simply looks at all the complexity of what will really make life work better, and what will not. All desires, slogans, party platforms, and even past precedents cannot change the laws of Nature, which is all Natural Law seeks to understand and use.

TLs 1-3 may frequently pretend to be Natural Law, claiming that the laws they want will truly benefit people's lives. Whether it be the decrees of a TL 1 Despot, the political propaganda of a TL 2 Council, or even the time-tested precedents of TL 3 Common Law, all will tend to insist that their laws are good, beneficial, and needed. But that doesn't mean they are. Just because a TL 1 dictator exhorts his people passionately about why they need him, and why the laws he creates are essential to a happy life, doesn't mean they really are. Just because a political party shouts about figures and statistics that it claims prove its point, doesn't mean anything conclusive. In the end, they all want what they want, and they want it to be enforced as law.

The crucial difference between these lower TLs and Natural Law is, of course, how we think of law itself. We can tell how any culture truly views law by looking at what they do when two TLs of law come into conflict. For example, after Rome fell back into the cudgel of TL 1 Despotism under Augustus Caesar, the Roman Senate still existed, and the Roman Empire maintained the outward appearance of a republic. Rome had both an Emperor and a Senate, so was it TL 1 law or TL 2, or some mix? Well, we can tell by looking at what Rome did when the two apparent TLs of law came into conflict. If the Senate (TL 2) ever tried to go against the Emperor (TL 1), the Emperor's word was law. This means the Senators were truly nothing more than glorified advisors, and Rome's law was really TL 1. Even if Augustus shrewdly refused to even call himself Emperor at first, he was an autocratic Despot, ruling with all the one-sided myopia of TL 1 law.

This is tremendously common among Despots, a clever desire to appear to honor TL 2+ law while truly concentrating all real power in a very small group of people, or even only one person. And TL 2 political parties routinely attempt to appear TL 3 or 4, yet we can still see their true TL of law by looking at what they do when different TLs come into conflict. If the majority votes in favor of the ideals of a political party, but that vote violates some of the time-tested lessons of Common Law, what does the victorious party do? Does the party say, "Ah, well Common Law shows that this will not work out well, and that holds more weight than the temporary opinions of the current crowd," or does it say, "Hey, we won, deal with it"? The actions of the victor will show us what TL of law they truly use.

And just as LL 2 people \*love\* to say how LL 4 they are, TL 2 political parties love to pretend to care about TL 4 Natural Law. But what do they really do, when the two TLs come into conflict? Most modern political parties attempt to prove how their own ideals will make life better, which is in effect trying to force TL 4 Natural Law to fit their own desired TL 2 political platform. Their passionate ideals are what truly rule, and all Nature is bent to try to make those ideals appear right, even if it means ignoring, maligning, or simplifying all opposing points of view.

A truly TL 4 political party would not spend its efforts on the marketing and advertising campaigns of trying to sway the crowd, but would put the overwhelming majority of its energy into \*discovering\* what truly works, and then happily changing its own platform whenever new discoveries show any flaw in the party's current ideals. A culture that is truly TL 4 in law will allow the testable, repeatable lessons of Natural Law to overrule any leader, any majority vote, and even the lessons of precedent.

And just as no LL 2 person can actually become LL 4 without first growing into LL 3, no culture can really become TL 4 in law without first learning to use and honor TL 3 Common Law. A culture that insists that the word of the majority is the ultimate authority (TL 2) will find it impossible to stomach the idea of submitting our cherished ideals to the cold consequences of Nature (TL 4). TL 3 is a necessary preparatory step to get there. Learning to honor the lessons of the past as an indispensable safeguard against kneejerk majority opinions (and when it comes to cultures, a "kneejerk" can last decades), prepares a culture to submit to the more complex and far less obvious lessons of Nature itself. Just as LL 2 people tend to want to ignore the inconvenient lessons of their own or others' past, saying "Yeah, but I don't care, I \*want\* this," so also a TL 2 legal culture tends to resent the lessons of Common Law as a bothersome parent that gets in the way of one's own immature desires.

Yet as a culture learns to treasure the life-changing safety of Common Law above even their own cherished ideals, as a respect for precedent actually becomes one of the highest of their ideals, then they grow prepared for the far more complex challenges of Natural Law. An adult needs LL 3 honor and self-discipline before they can truly grow into the rigorous lack of ego in LL 4, and a culture needs TL 3 Common Law before it can really grow to use TL 4 Natural Law. Nature cannot be coerced, convinced, marketed to, or debated with; its consequences happen whether we like them or not, and we can learn to use them the way we use electricity, or we can suffer by denying them, as if denying an oncoming train will change its inexorable momentum.

The culture in the American Colonies in the 1750s (20 years before the explosive conflict began) reflected a practical respect for TL 4 Natural Law in a way that few large-scale cultures ever have. In most of the colonists' minds, Natural Law simply made sense. These were people who (generally speaking) had taken the lessons of Britain's TL 3 Common Law into a harsh and unforgiving New World, and so had needed to learn how to thrive amid the cold realities of Nature. They loved Common Law, holding it as the precious safeguard of decency and safety against tyranny, but they also became acutely acquainted with situations where Common Law was not enough. This little culture, which had to learn to survive so far from the comforts of home, naturally developed a sensible and rigorous Natural Law mentality.

This mentality quickly asked the perennial IL 4 question: why? Why law? What is it, really? Why kings, why rulers of any kind? What makes law good, and what makes it bad? Why?

While LL 2 and TL 2 law tend to simply accept what they're given, insisting that there's no alternative to the way things are already done, TL 4 law went back to the Why. Throughout the TL 4 Renaissance, political philosophers had raised daring questions about the nature of kings and nations, of civilization and law, where they came from and how they should be. And in the American Colonies in the 1750s, the past centuries of daring ideas came to a boil.

More people came to believe that the pure realities of Nature should take precedence over the decrees of a monarch, the votes of a Parliament, and even the lessons of Common Law. Many found it "revolting" to bind themselves to a blind veneration of antiquity when Natural Law clearly showed a better way. They sought an understanding of law that would simply make life better for everyone, beyond all the limitations of tradition, the narrow special interests of wrangling parties, and even the words of a king. And while these colonists spoke a great deal about Deity in regards to law, they tended to be suspicious of the potential abuses of traditional religion, instead viewing God as the embodiment of Natural Law itself. If law was simply the science of what makes life run well, then mankind could no more invent their own laws than they could invent laws of physics. In TL 4 Natural Law, law is something to be discovered through science, not created by whim or even careful tradition.

Natural Law is the Scientific Method applied to law. It is the science of rigorously discovering what nurtures life and civilization, and what chokes it. When faced with a hot-button issue, Natural Law ignores buzzwords, slogans, simplistic pseudo-principles and bizarrely selective statistics, and simply asks, "What will make life work?"

For instance, on the question of...hm, let's go with gun control, because it's a hot topic that's not too hot for me to even want to mention yet; on the question of gun control, TL 4 Natural Law avoids all the mudslinging emotional nonsense of the TL 2 majority rule arena. It doesn't bother with warring statistics about how many lives are saved or lost by guns, it doesn't waste time with appeals to simplistic moral truisms, and it's even very cautious with Common Law traditions and preexisting laws. Instead of getting mired in all that, it gets back to the Why of all law, and simply works to discover what really makes life better and what does not.

It discovers this not through one-sided political rhetoric, but through careful, patient study and experiment, rigorously seeking to expose all sides of an issue in its pursuit of whatever will make life work. While TL 2 political parties and even TL 1 dictators always seem able to find isolated academic studies in support of whatever they want, TL 4 Natural Law seeks to study more and more, inquire and investigate more and more, without hoping for any preconceived conclusion. It just wants to know what works, like any honest science does.

In America's case specifically, even the U.S. Constitution is subject to Natural Law, as it was designed according to Natural Law and equipped with mechanisms to amend it as Natural Law advanced. And Natural Law did advance as a science, for a time, before slowly falling back into the stagnant passiveness of TL 3 Common Law in the early 20th Century. Under this regressed version of Common Law, the Constitution itself became the greatest repository of Common Law, an immovable document for judges and lawmakers to rely on, rather than an ever-improvable scientific invention. And in more recent times, TL 2 law has continued the trend of IL 2 mimicking and mocking IL 4, pretending to view the Constitution as an improvable thing but really viewing it as a marginalized artifact which is improved not through the scientific caution of amendment by Natural Law, but rather through the all-too-convenient caprice of subjective legal interpretation. This is not science, not Natural Law, and certainly not IL 4 in any manner. It's often kinda TL 1.

TL 4 Natural Law seeks consistent, usable definitions, not buzzwords and propaganda. It seeks to discover law as the preexisting principles of what makes life work, just as other sciences seek to discover what makes anything else work. In the words of the legendary pioneering Natural Law scientist Thomas Paine (ENFP(ij)), "Man cannot make principles, he can only discover them."

Likewise, man cannot make "rights," he can only discover them. Rights have become the buzzword of all buzzwords these days, used to claim a right to anything and everything. Rights have become a ready-made way to claim moral high ground for whatever we might happen to want at the moment. Originally, however, "rights" was actually a scientific term referring to the things that are \*right\* to make lives and cultures flourish. For example, when pioneers of Natural Law determined that everyone had a right to property, that was not an idealistic, fluffy hope, it was a statement of scientific discovery: they had determined, through much careful study, that life and society worked better when individuals had control of their own property, and when no laws infringed on their property without their consent. Thus, all people had a "right" to property: it was right of them to keep their own.

The oft-quoted rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" were discoveries, and they were a big deal. Under older TLs of law, even TL 3 Common Law, some people were considered to have a privilege over others, such that they could take others' property, liberty, even their lives. A king was considered to have ultimate privilege over others. Natural Law determined that this yields poor results, and that life works better when each person's life, liberty, property, and pursuit of happiness is left unhindered. Of course, science is rarely simple, and Natural Lawyers dug deep to discover how these rights applied, and what happened when they were violated.

Today, we often implicitly accept that government has a right to take from us, as long as the TL 2 majority votes it into law. Robbing Peter to subsidize Paul, and doing it with force of law. When we debate hot issues, and when those issues are made into law, there is very little science of any kind, but rather sophistry, word-wrangling, and the all-important marketing of modern politics. When we debate what is or isn't a "right," Natural Law science is hardly even imagined; rather, we appeal to definition-deficient moral arguments riddled with assumptions and poor conclusions. We have too many convoluted laws for anyone to keep track of, including lawmakers, and the law itself has become a weapon used in lawsuits where innocence is no assurance of avoiding ruin. Taxes are wildly invasive and complicated, violating so many scientific principles of what makes a culture thrive that the total tonnage of foolishness could stun a team of oxen in its tracks.

Political discussion seems more and more rabid and less and less connected with any real scientific approach to law. We've become savages in this most crucial form of technology, the backbone of culture that makes or breaks everything else.

When the TL of law lags behind, a culture's LL seems to go with it, every time. And when LL languishes, then every other aspect of society, culture, science, entertainment, philosophy, invention, religion, everything, everything suffers in the narrow blindness of low Life Levels.

So while our popular culture fills our minds with so much noise and passion, duping us into thinking we have to choose between equally rotten TL 2 extremes in every election, it's our very approach to laws and elections themselves that's the problem. As long as we approach our laws, our nations, and our private lives with the attitudes of TL 2 law, things are only going to get yuckier. As long as we slip back into lower LLs, we're going to get pulled into the mudwrestling of politics, seeing the flaws of only one side and the benefits of only the other. It is crucially important for us to want to be involved, to help, to make life better, but as long as we think TL 2 is the only way to do that, then we're still buying the cultural lie.

But what alternative is there? How do we reclaim higher TLs of law? We begin with ourselves and our own attitudes toward law. We don't have to make a fuss, and we certainly don't have to break the laws we already have, but as we change our attitude from the TL 2 majority-makes-right mindset, as we grow more and more used to learning from history (TL 3), and as we step back from all the furious debate and seek to find whatever really works, even if it goes against what we expect (TL 4), then we can become an influence for healthier and better attitudes toward law and life itself, because by definition the two are always intertwined.

And of course, this is only a 2.1 post. This is just laying the groundwork definitions of what the first few TLs of law are. As we go forward, we're gonna give you guys more and more tools that you can use to keep your own lives safe, happy, and prosperous, applying the principles of TL 4 Natural Law and more. Because you know, in a culture of TL 2 law, TL 4+ is a ridiculous advantage.

In short, the aim of TL 4 law is, in the words of the U.S. Constitution, to "establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity." To make life happy, safe, prosperous and free. At TL 1 law exists to control, at TL 2 it provides order even if it's unjust, and at TL 3 it ensures safety and justice, but only with TL 4 Natural Law does it truly become a force for unprecedented growth, betterment, and progress. At TL 4, law exists to make life work.

## TL 5 Law - Innovative Law

Now we start getting into uncharted waters. In the early days of the TL 5 Industrial Era, there was a bit of flirtation with TL 5 Innovative Law, but like LL 5, it never really got to take hold. The culture was already choosing unhealthiness in too many ways, and it was beginning to turn backward. By the mid-19th century, even the most advanced cultures had fallen back hard onto TL 4 Natural Law, while less-healthy locales were already sliding into TL 2 or below.

Fortunately, the natural progression of ILs allows us to consistently see what higher LLs and TLs are like, even TLs of law that our culture never really got to enjoy. (At present, we've figured out up through TL 27 law, but we've stopped there because even though it's awesome, it's just too far away to be more than a glorious gleam in the distance!) We're gonna save the explanation of TL 6-7 law until Phase 2.3, and then we won't get to TL 8 law (the TL we \*should\* be at today) until Phase 2.8, but we're gonna get there as soon as we can!

In the early years of TL 5, though, law started to advance into the next quantum of change beyond TL 4 Natural Law. We call TL 5 law "Innovative Law" because it builds on the Scientific Method of Natural Law and adds so much more, boldly striking forward into infinite new horizons the way everything at TL 5 and IL 5 does.

While Natural Law centers around what works, what makes lives and cultures flourish, Innovative Law perpetually asks the question "What could make it work even \*better\*?" To discover this, Innovative Law continually sets up little experiments where it can test daring hypotheses regarding what might make life work even better than the current discoveries of Natural Law. A functioning culture of TL 5 law would end up with numerous "experimental laws" being tested out by different communities, to see if they'd be good on a culture-wide scale, trying ever bolder and more advanced laws and policies. This would cause the science of law to race forward, discovering entirely new breakthroughs at a pace that would take Natural Law centuries to match.

Yet when lower TLs of law try this sort of bold experimentation without first developing TL 4 Natural Law or TL 3 Common Law, they're like kids playing with dynamite. Without the disciplined stability of Common Law or the developed framework of Natural Law, any attempt at experimental laws ends up ruining lives and shattering cultures. Experiments that would be successful at TL 5 end up collapsing catastrophically under the one-sided adolescent passions of TL 2 or below. Even well-intentioned individuals with a respect for Natural Law cannot force TL 5 Innovative Law onto a TL 2 culture; it will always end explosively as the TL 2 culture becomes ever more imbalanced with worse injustices than before.

Idealistic communes and intentional communities often try to create their own brave new ideas for a utopia, but without higher TLs of law, they always end the same way: in dissention and dissolution, frequently with plenty of hidden scandals and cultish compulsion along the way. Without the clear, disciplined Scientific Method of Natural Law, any bold attempts at

Innovative Law will wander aimlessly at best, and usually destroy lives. Yet many (perhaps most?) idealistic communities fail to apply even TL 3 Common Law, happily striding forward with an exciting set of philosophies without really taking the time to check whether this exact sort of idea has already been tried in the past. You can't skip quanta of growth; when we try, we get shoddy imitations that tend to blow up in our faces.

True TL 5 Innovative Law, by contrast, builds upon the rock-solid foundation of all the previous TLs of law. Its legal experiments always benefit life, even when they fail, because the discipline of TLs 3-4 ensures that the experiments are always careful, just, and fair. During TL 5 law, a rapidly growing library of legal principles develops, far beyond the fondest imaginings of TL 4 Natural Law scientists. We have no such cultural understanding today; our oversized legal tomes and our bloated law schools focus instead on the labyrinthine tangle of our runaway TL 2 law, with a light influence from a long-gone TL 3 Common Law.

The American Constitution was a prototypical example of early TL 5 Innovative Law at work. It was the culmination of labors of not only TL 4 Natural Law, but also years of small-scale experimentation in the unique laboratory of the colonies. The American Founders began with the daring clarity of Natural Law, then asked, "But what about more?" How could they put Natural Law into practice on a large scale, in ways that had never been attempted before? How could they spread liberty across a large nation, something that most considered unfeasible? How, how could they make it work?

The principle of intentionally separating the major powers of government into branches with proverbial "checks and balances" was a genius invention of early TL 5 Innovative Law, pushing beyond the limits of Natural Law to find out how to do more. It was based on lessons of TL 3 Common Law, but never before had it been done intentionally, deliberately designed to yield a result of greater liberty, justice, and stability. The disparate Founders experimented with clever ways to keep political power limited, since Common Law and Natural Law had taught them how persistently those in power will seek to find abuses and loopholes. So much deliberation and experimentation went into the process which produced that Constitution, and in the end the document itself was an experiment. They believed it would work based on all their previous science, but it was by no means certain.

And in the end, they knew their Constitution left more questions than answers, as most experiments do. The question of slavery haunted many of them, who feared it would be the undoing of all their labors and sacrifices. The cultural respect for Natural Law was not quite strong enough to tackle such a passionate subject, long entrenched in TL 3 traditions and TL 2 special interests. The question of enumerating specific rights was one that never got to be fully experimented on in any way; America's treasured Bill of Rights is in fact a stopgap temporary measure, thrown in due to the absence of proper experimentation, which would have yielded a far stronger and more comprehensive result. The nature and powers of the presidency, the adaptability of the houses of Congress to a rapidly growing nation, the exact powers of judicial review, and a clear science regarding the relation of the states to one another, all these and other questions were left inconclusively answered, and over the next centuries those loose threads began to pull the experiment apart, piece by piece.

Civil war ended up resolving many of these questions, not science, and while we rightly laud the end of the abomination of slavery, many of the other questions were given very poor answers by the brute force of war. Innovative Law would have developed a far greater science regarding the relation of states to each other, the powers and makeup of the branches of government, and the handling of regional interests, rather than simply enforcing a hamfisted one-sided solution by the mouth of cannons. Innovative Law would not have taken a further hundred years (and more) to resolve racism, and would certainly have resolved the issue long before war ever loomed, but our culture only barely grasped the earliest morning rays of TL 5 law before slipping back into the comparative limitations of TL 4 Natural Law, and then further down from there.

Yet even after all this, even with all its flaws, the American Constitution is regarded by many worldwide as something of a marvel. Its stability and longevity seem surprising to some, and eager new TL 2 democracies frequently seek to model themselves after it. However, mysteriously, they often find that their attempted reproductions don't work, and end up collapsing back into TL 1 tyranny. Thus most of the free world instead opts for a safer, less advanced, legislative-heavy Parliamentary system (this is not a slight against any nations, simply an observation of how the TLs of law are at work). The answer to the mystery is that the undeserving American culture has inherited a marvelous mad-scientist invention of early TL 5 law, so obviously it cannot be reproduced by cultures without TLs 3 and 4. When they try, it fails.

It's a testament to the sheer strength of TL 5 law that the American Constitution has survived through all the intervening years of regressing LL in as decent a shape as it has. But even TL 5 law isn't perfect, and its prototype Constitution has had less and less of an effect on its degenerating culture. This is perhaps a large part of why nationalistic 'Muricans are so insufferably annoying, because we can tell that they don't deserve it, they're just LL 2-3 as usual, riding the wave of an immense prosperity which they did nothing at all to earn. They shout buzzwords like "free country" without any comprehension of the original science behind such misused terms. The "American Dream" has been mutilated into an entirely financial thing, rather than the measured ideals of TL 4-5 legal science.

Yet as each of us individually studies the lessons of higher TLs of law, we can apply them in our own lives, to tremendous personal advantage. Law is the science of life, the science of what makes life work well and what does not, and we can



reap its rewards on an individual level even if we do still suffer from the injustices of a wildly off-balance TL 2 law culture.

We can be good influences on those around us, and we can learn and apply the lessons of Common Law and Natural Law, and then even Innovative Law, in all our plans, dreams, goals, and interactions. And then we'll be prepared for more, for TL 6 and 7 and on!

I know of no culture anywhere that ever got to enjoy TL 6+ law on a large scale, since TL 5 sputtered out so early (altho, to brag, we do employ TL 8 law on aLBoP, on our very small scale!). During the TL 6 Mechanized Era in the early 20th century, most law was slipping back to TL 3 or below. But that only makes us more excited to be able to go back now and show the natural, unavoidable quanta of how law advances (or regresses), how the congested crap we live with today is not the only option, it's not normal or healthy, and there are better ways. Rather than get frustrated with national and international politics, we can step back from the TL 2 chaos and simply work on learning to apply higher TL law attitudes in our own lives and interactions.